

CCMP Revision - Living Resources Subcommittee Meeting #3
January 29, 2015

Attendees: Julian Wood, David Woodbury, Arthur Feinstein, Gordon Becker, Joy Albertson, Judy Kelly, Caitlin Sweeney, Karen McDowell

Subcommittee Members Not in Attendance: Barbara Salzman, Beth Hunning

NOTES ON PROPOSED ACTIONS (with next steps/assignments noted in red)

Action 1 – Assessment Framework and restoration guide for tidal marsh restoration (JW)

- Written to focus on new types of restoration. Take information in the past and get it out there to refine these practices.
- PWA guide about 15 years old.
Living shorelines
Marsh mounds
Not just limited to these
- Focus is on bird metrics
- Develop an assessment framework for SF Bay tidal wetland restoration projects using multiple bird species as indicators that will be used to assess, prioritize and refine restoration and management strategies. Look at JV M&E plan – overlap with Habitats Subcommittee
- We have CRAM now, but it is not focused on Birds much.
- Re: CRAM and birds. The third and most costly level is wildlife. Bird measurements can be cheap. It shouldn't be underneath CRAM. Use Birds and CRAM.

JW will flesh these out likely as two actions – assessment framework and restoration guide

Action 2 - Restore Wetlands including the Delta (DW)

- Central Valley JV for the delta (in addition to SFBJV)

Defer to habitat group, but we will bring it back here. It will be more specific.

Action 3 Implement the tidal march ecosystem recovery plan (AF)

- Talks about areas that should be protected
- There is a whole process to implement a recovery plan, but it is a very slow process. We need to help speed this up.
- Even in the absence of a TME recovery group, it gives recommendations of details of goals: acreage recommendations, etc.
- Can we track progress over 5 years?
- Can track implementation spatially with integration with JV project tracker
- Tracking: bring in stakeholder process where you get commitments from stakeholders to implement (this isn't happening).
- Possible output – establishment of the stakeholder groups?

AF & JA will flesh this one out – pull out critical components to push forward that are measurable.

Action 4 – study to ascertain % of lands included as proposed restoration sites as well as important existing functioning sites in the Tidal Marsh Ecosystem Recovery Plan that are currently being considered for development (AF)

- AF can list 4 big ones right now. 1) Coliseum city, 2) RRC salt work, 3?, 4) Foster City,
- This might be part of Action number 3
- Climate change heron's head park – only a strip now. Things are really changing. Use king tides to foreshadow impact

AF and JA will work on this - link this in to the tidal marsh recovery plan action above

Action 5 - protect high priority upland sites for marsh migration (JW)

- You get into property values and development schedules
- It is how you word it. These are areas that would “allow for” - no parcel is identified (like BEHGU)
- 1st identify areas – outcome listed is not achievable in 5 years
- SLR Spin – provide refugia for higher tides (don't have marsh adjacent to 50' seawall)
- Promote acquisitions of land to adjacent uplands
- This will help organizations to get funding to get these sites
- Try to make our nearshore development not become New Orleans
- Link to new SOE indicator that Josh Collins is working on

Keep as is for now, but likely revise with Josh Collins' help/Habitat Subcommittee – CS will track

Action 6 -Implement Green infrastructure flood protection projects (JW)

- Looking for good case studies – horizontal levees, living shorelines, etc.
- Have tools to facilitate - OCOF and Point Blue Future Marshes tool
- Take advantage of need to protect shoreline to get additional habitat
- Number in output, but not in Action?
- Link to cities green infrastructure requirements – criteria for funding?
- Specifically talking about using habitat in the bay to project shorelines
- Maybe two separate actions re: “green infrastructure” – one for stormwater capture, etc. and one for bayland restoration/flood protection/SLR adaptation

Keep for now – CS to work with Habitats Subcommittee on “nature-based adaptation” action, JK to work with Water on green infrastructure

Action 7 – Flow recommendations (GB)

Defer to Water Subcommittee – CS will link GB in

Action 8 Develop and implement dry season impairment standards for streams tributary to the SF Estuary (GB)

- JK – Looking at State Boards Policy (NC Instream flow policy). How is this linked to that? There is no effective mechanism to keep water in streams in summer. They are trying to save coho in the Russian river. Asking people to not divert. GB
- JK talked to Felecia Marcus – Do they have a water rights attorney. No and probably can't get one. Maybe we can get someone at the Regional Board.

GB & JK will work on this

Action 9 Restore natural hydrograph (DW)

- Higher level than 8

DW will flush this out – pull out anything specific that is measurable

Action 10 Riparian corridor standards for tributaries (GB)

- Output - ??? Are you looking for guidelines or legal requirements?
- The region comes together and says it is a priority and then adopt it. But how?
- Need to implement guidelines.
- We need policy and enforcement (county level?)
- State of Washington has streamside management zones (not in 5 years, but we could accomplish some steps).
- If you want to make it effective, apply it to identified key areas. Protect cold water refugia.

GB will work on this – need a more specific output

Action 11 Brownfield development (GB)

- Why do we need to turn over undeveloped land to development when we have other options
- Is there some specific way to move this idea? Plan Bay Area for example
- Challenging politically
- Make the connection to the health of the estuary.
- Many others working on this – ABAG, non-profits, EPA has a program. Would be a new direction for SFEP

Keep for now, but will revisit later. CS will track

Action 12 Project and Improve Overwintering Habitat for Shorebirds and Waterfowl (BS)

- Ranges of tidal marsh versus managed ponds – important
- Action 14 Roosting is a separate thing than habitat
- Combine actions for shorebirds and waterfowl – specific needs v. general habitat restoration

JW to work on actions 12-15 - will work with JA, BS, BH, others (CS can facilitate)

Action 16 Expand Don Edwards (AF)

- Make it more expansive

AF will work on expanding to include entire refuge complex

Action 17 –Salmon Fishery Rebuilding Program (Barry N)

- Not in our planning area – no commercial salmon fisheries in bay or delta
- Could focus on Herring for Bay – focus on creek mouths
- Also using tidal marsh channel mouths
- Other fish? White sturgeon – really a contaminants issue (eat Asian clams, which they can't digest)
- one action would be to incorporate fixed fish sensitivity when planning salt marsh restoration
- Identifying opportunities for restoring functions of creek mouths - Action?
- Relationship to Flood Control 2.0 work on tidal/fluvial interface

CS will work on creating new action focused on tidal/fluvial interface (importance to fish), will work with Habitats Subcommittee as well.

Action 18 Nesting success/predator control – Reducing impacts of predators (Nadav)

- Might be part of tidal marsh recovery plan
- Cats, Raccoons, skunks (don't just focusing on cats)
- Possible action also in stewardship section

JA will work on predator control. JW can help too (and JK for what to put in stewardship)

Action 19 – Increase Ridgway's Rail population – refugia, predator control (JW)

- Predator control part can go into 18

JW will change action to focus on High tide refugia (to reduce risk of predation)

Action 20 Reduce Contamination (DW)

- defer to Water Subcommittee

CS and JK will make sure DW reviews contaminant actions from Water Subcommittee

Action 21 Invasive species (DW)

KM will develop action (will work with DW)

Action 22 Discouraging Development on resource-rich shoreline (AF)

- Challenge to develop an action on this – where can CCMP help? Who would owner be? What outcome?

Keep for now – CS and AK will continue to think about how to develop

Action 23 Establish monitoring parameters and sampling programs that allow tracking key ecological processes for successful adaptive management (GB)

- SFBJV has a new science team (JA) is on this
- Knowing stream flows
- Make this more specific
- Josh Collins can talk about monitoring
- Need to focus on riparian health and stream flow
- Long term monitoring for Key species so we have a sense of trends

Will review with Habitats Subcommittee – may pull out specific stream monitoring needs for fish as Living Resources Action. CS will track and link in GB

Action 24 (NEW) – Delta-specific Birds (AF)

CS to follow up with Letitia and others working on SOE